

### **Remarks**

In this response, claims 27, 31, 37, and 40 have been amended. Support for these amendments is found throughout the originally filed specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 3-6, 10-11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 40-43, and 45 are pending.

### **Objections to the Drawings**

In the Office Action, objections were raised with respect to Figures 2, 4, 6, and 8. In response, the Applicant presents formal figures on replacement sheets 1-8 to replace these and the remaining figures. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these objections to the drawings.

### **Claim Rejections**

#### **35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Office Action, claims 3, 6, 10-11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 40-43, and 45 were rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,622) (hereinafter "Blinn") in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,047) (hereinafter "Wolff"), in view of Bezos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141) (hereinafter "Bezos") and further in view of Tobin (US 2001/0007991). The Applicant traverses these rejections.

Even assuming there are sufficient reasons to combine all of these references together in the asserted manner, which the Applicants dispute, the resulting combination would still fail to provide all of the elements of claim 27, when considered as a whole as is required.

Claim 27 recites, in part, an information server to interpret a second portion of a pseudo resource identifier as a marketing code identifying a type of media used to

disseminate the URL. As described in the specification URLs may be disseminated by any of a variety of types of media. Thus, a portion of the URL may be modified to inform the information server of the type of media that was used to disseminate that particular URL. This information may allow the information server to maintain statistics (which is also an element of claim 27) on the effectiveness of the various types of media at disseminating the URLs.

Bezos, which was relied upon for this teaching, fails to teach or suggest this element. Bezos teaches an Internet-based customer referral system in which an associate may communicate a URL, and related product information, to a potential customer through a store of catalog documents. Bezos column 6, lines 67 et seq. Bezos teaches that the catalog documents may be disseminated through a hypertextual media type (e.g., Internet) or a non-hypertextual media type (e.g., a paper-based product catalog). Bezos column 8, lines 32 – 48. While the URL may include an ID to identify the agent and/or the store, it is clear that the same URL will be used regardless of the media type employed for dissemination. This is because the only information relevant to Bezos' teachings is the identification of the associate/store for a commission reward. The type of media used to disseminate the URL is irrelevant to Bezo's system and, therefore, it is not tracked.

Furthermore, Bezos expressly teaches away from providing information in the URL that is indicative of the dissemination technique. The generic nature of dissemination is specifically relied upon by Bezos so that the associate "...can use or switch between multiple catalog dissemination techniques (Web, e-mail, PUSH, etc.) without affecting the ability of the merchant Web site to identify and credit the associate." Bezos, column 9: lines 2-5. See also column 8, lines 50 – 54 in which it is made clear that while each associate is only provided one associate ID, they may distribute the URL with that particular ID through any of a variety of dissemination techniques. Therefore, Bezos specifically teaches away from providing detail as to the type of media used to disseminate the URL.

While the Applicant believes the above distinctions are sufficient to show patentability of claim 27 over the cited references, the Applicant has also presented an additional amendment to claim 27 to further define the claim over the cited references in an effort to advance prosecution to issuance. Claim 27 has been amended to recite, in part, that “at least a portion of information presented in the associated information page refers to the type of media.” In this manner, as described on page 25, lines 15-19 of the specification, the information page further refines and customizes the information provisioned to the requesting client.

Tobin teaches that a webpage is modified to include aspects of a referring webpage to take advantage of a consumer's existing familiarity with the referring webpage. However, simply modifying a webpage based on content of a referring webpage does not teach or make obvious the provision of information that refers to the type of media of the referring source. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest or imply that the content incorporated from the referring source refers to the fact that the referring source is a webpage. While the type of media may be assumed and/or understood, there is no articulable reason for Tobin to provide information in the webpage that specifically refers to it.

For at least these reasons, claim 27 is patentable over any combination of these references.

Claims 3-6, 10-11, 23, 26, 28, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 40-43, and 45 depend from claim 27 or include elements similar to at least some of those discussed above. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over any combination of these references.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn et al., Wolff, Bezos et al., and Tobin, as applied to independent claim 27 above, and further in view of Bijlagte (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,680) (hereinafter “Bijlagte”); and claim 5 was rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn et al., Wolff, Bezos et al., and Tobin as applied to independent claim 27 above, and further in view of

Kirkevold et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,322) (hereinafter "Kirkevold"). These claims depend from claim 27 and are patentable over these combinations for at least the reasons provided above.

### **Conclusion**

For these reasons the Applicants believe the present claims are patentable over the cited references and, therefore, respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 04/15/2009

/Nathan R. Maki/  
Nathan R. Maki  
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: 503-222-9981